

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

100-55442

NALED

FM 110 12/22/81

EEN 5544.1

also (1,2-dibromo-2,2-dichloroethyl) c

SEARCH EEN DISC 40 TOPIC 51-3540

FORMULATION 2 - FID - LATION NOT IDENTIFIED

FICHE/MASTER IN 00074882

CONTENT CAT 01

Chevron Chemical Company (1960) Toxicity of Dibrom to Fish and
wildlife. (Compilation; unpublished study received Sep 27,
1965 under unknown admin. no.; CCL1125232-L)

SUBST. CLASS = 6.

OTHER SUBJECT DESCRIPTIONS

SEC: EEN -41- 51-3543

EEN -40- 51-3547

TOX -40- 51-3532

EEN -41- 51-3543

EEN -40- 51-3547

EEN -41- 51-3542

DIRECT RVA TIME =

(10) START-DATE

END DATE

REVIEWED BY: Kyle Dambek

TITLE: Wildlife Biologist

ORG: HED/EEB

LOC/TEL: CM2-1121/557-1121

SIGNATURE: 

DATE: 24/8/82

APPROVED BY:

TITLE:

ORG:

LOC/TEL:

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

1. Chemical: Naled
2. Formulation: Dibrom (Formulation?)
3. Citation: Chevron Chemical Company, 1960. Toxicity of dibrom to fish and Wildlife (Compilation, unpublished study received Sept. 27, 1965 under unknown admin. no.: CDL: 125232-L) I.D.#00074882
4. Reviewed by: Kyle Barbehenn, Wildlife Biologist
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)
5. Date Reviewed: September 23, 1982
6. Test Type: Simulated aquatic and terrestrial field tests.
7. Reported results: Under the conditions of the tests, Dibrom was not toxic to Gambusia, tropical fish, parakets and wildlife.
8. Reviewer's Conclusion: The results of these studies are scientifically sound but they are inadequate to fulfill any guideline data requirements.

Methods/Materials

Test Procedures: Field studies were conducted in three areas (Florida) treated with 0.1 lb/A dibrom by air. Use of oil-sensitive *cards* indicated that 40% of the spray material reached the ground. Fish were exposed in cartons and birds in cages; 30 minutes after exposure they were brought to a *certain* loction for *central* further observation for up to 48 hours post-treatment. Incidental observations were made of natural population^s of fish and wildlife. ¹

Statistical Analysis: None

Discussion/Results: No adverse effects of the dibrom treatments were observed.

Reviewer's Evaluation:

Procedures: The test organisms employed here would not be acceptable under current testing standards.

Statistical Analysis: N/A

Discussion/Results: Some useful informtion was obtained from the experiments but the results cannot be used to extrapolate to natural populations of concern. There is no basic toxicity data on the birds and fish and Gambusia population^s utilized may have had previous exposure to pesticides. Field observations were generally inadequate.

Conclusions:

Validation category: Supplemental

Category rationale: Results of limited usefulness in evaluating risk to natural populutions

Category repairability: N/A